

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. Applicant has rewritten claims 1, 12 canceled claims 4-7 and 13-20 and added new claims 21-29. Favorable reconsideration of this application is, consequently, earnestly solicited in view of the following remarks.

Claims 13-20 were objected to as being of improper dependent form. This objection is now moot since these claims have been canceled.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under sec. 103 as being unpatentable as being obvious over Kozak '384 in view of Payne '154 and Lam '016.

Subject independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the "adapter head" includes a "a pair of opposite facing clockwise oriented lower-case b shaped slots....", which is described on pages 6-7 of the specification and shown in reference to Figures 1 and 4A-5B of the drawings.

Subject independent claim 12 has been amended to include "providing an adapter head having a pair of opposite facing same directing facing and oriented lower-case b shaped slots..." New dependent claim 21 claims these "lower-case b shaped slots" are both oriented and directed "clockwise" and claim 22 claims these "slots" are both oriented and directed "counter-clockwise."

New independent claim 23 is similar to claim 1 but has "a pair of opposite facing clockwise oriented lower-case b shaped slots....", which encompasses the embodiment shown and described in reference to Fig. 6.

These claimed features are substantially and structurally different from any so-called "slots" that the examiner refers to in the references of record. Kozak '384 clearly

is limited to vertically elongated slots as shown in their various figures that have nothing to do with opening and closing “windows and shutters” as also required by the subject claims. Payne ‘154 shows T shaped slots for use with a “Trailer Landing Gear Device”, title, that has nothing to do with opening and closing “windows and shutters” as also required by the subject claims. Lam ‘016 has no “slots” whatsoever. Thus, removal of these references is respectfully requested.

Applicant strongly disagrees with the statements that the dimensions of subject claims 2(and also now claim 24) include “changes in size, or a particular size” that is “not sufficient to patentably distinguish over prior art....”

It is clearly improper for the examiner to arbitrarily ignore any of the novel features of any of the claims. Under the rules, if the applicant requests the examiner cite the reference(s) showing each and every one of the references that supports a rejection, the examiner must cite the reference or remove the rejection. Applicant requests the examiner specifically point out which uncited reference(s) describes and teaches these unsubstantiated opinions and assertions raised in the rejection that at least these features are obvious under sec. 103. If actual references are not cited and supplied to the applicant to show these unsubstantiated opinions and assertions mentioned in their rejection, the applicant respectfully requests removal the 103 rejection for at least these reasons alone.

The mere fact that someone in the art can rearrange parts of a reference device to meet the terms of a claim is not by itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for someone of ordinary skill in the art, without the benefit of the inventor’s specification to make the necessary changes in the reference device. Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co., 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984).

There is no teaching, nor suggestion for modifying the references of record to include all the novel features of the amended claims. Under well recognized rules of the MPEP (for example, section 706.02(j)), the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438(Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant contends the references cannot be modified to incorporate the features of subject claims 1-3, 8-12 and 21-29 without utilizing Applicant's disclosure. The courts have consistently held that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to Applicant to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, incentive or motivation supporting the combination. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is respectfully urged that claims 1-3, 8-12 and 21-29 be allowed. Such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully Submitted;



Brian S. Steinberger
Registration No. 36,423
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, Florida 32922
Telephone: (321) 633-5080

Date 12/9/04